

## REMARKS

### Traverse of rejection of claim 1 under §103

The examiner in the previous Office Action rejected the claims in part based upon the argument that the prior art taught the addition of stabilizers, and that therefore the use of an organic alcohol as a stabilizer would have been obvious to one skilled in the art. In its response to the prior Office Action the applicant amended the specification to clarify that the organic alcohol was not an added stabilizer, but rather a co-solvent providing unexpected results.

While maintaining the rejections, the examiner appears to have at least partially accepted the applicant's reasoning. In the current Office Action, the examiner appears to no longer assert that organic alcohols would have been chosen based upon their function as an added chemical stabilizer, but rather, "... for their mixing properties" (Office Action at page 3). It is respectfully believed that, while an organic alcohol could have been selected by one skilled in the art, there is no asserted rationale for him/her to do so. Even under the new examination guidelines following the Supreme Court's opinion in KSR, some rationale for why one skilled in the art would have chosen the feature of the claims must be articulated. In the present application, several unexpected benefits of using an organic co-solvent are discussed, including the ability to polymerize the initiated FA at room temperature; however the necessary motivation cannot be derived from the application itself.

### Rejection of claims 2-8 under §103

Claim 2 has been amended to include the limitation of a co-solvent removal step at room temperature such that the pH of the initiated FA mixture is reduced, as well as the cost-effective step of recovering the co-solvent for reuse. It is respectfully believed that the cited prior art would not lead one skilled in the art to pH-reducing, cost effective removal and recovery steps performed at room temperature. The cited prior art teaches the use of chemical stabilizers that are not capable of removal at room temperature, nor would result in the claimed pH reduction if they were

removed, and cannot be recovered for reuse in the same manner as an organic co-solvent having a low bp.

Claims dependent from clam 2 would by definition incorporate this limitation, which is believed to distinguish the claims over the cited prior art.